

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

		The state of the s		
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/427,291	10/26/1999	PAUL H BURMEISTER	S63.2-8606	2970
75	90 04/06/2004	EXAMINER		
VIDAS ARRETT & STEINKRAUS PA 6109 BLUE CIRCLE DRIVE			PREBILIC, PAUL B	
SUITE 2000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNETONKA, MN 553439131			3738	24
		DATE MAILED: 04/06/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	·	85			
	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/427,291	BURMEISTER ET AL.			
7. , 7	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Paul B. Prebilic	3738			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondenc address					
THE REPLY FILED 22 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe	avoid abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension of the state of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the han SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE ate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 insion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>22 January 2004</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	S :				
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to: 22-32,34 and 35					
Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) ap	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:		Paul Prelos			
		Paul B. Prebilic			
		Primary Examiner			





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: It was not persuasive in that Applicant's showing requires the assumption of a number of parameters in order to lend support to the claimed invention. For this reason, the Examiner asserts that the claim language lacks clear original support.